

## FEDERAL MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION

601 NEW JERSEY AVENUE, NW  
SUITE 9500  
WASHINGTON, DC 20001

SECRETARY OF LABOR, MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH ADMINISTRATION (MSHA)	:	Docket No. LAKE 2006-118 A.C. No. 11-00877-75030
v.	:	Docket No. LAKE 2006-119 A.C. No. 11-00877-77796
WABASH MINE HOLDING COMPANY	:	

BEFORE: Duffy, Chairman; Jordan, Suboleski, and Young, Commissioners

### ORDER

BY THE COMMISSION:

This matter arises under the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977, 30 U.S.C. § 801 et seq. (2000) (“Mine Act”).<sup>1</sup> On May 30, 2006, the Commission received from Wabash Mine Holding Company (“Wabash”) motions made by counsel to reopen two penalty assessments that had become final orders of the Commission pursuant to section 105(a) of the Mine Act, 30 U.S.C. § 815(a).

Under section 105(a) of the Mine Act, an operator who wishes to contest a proposed penalty must notify the Secretary of Labor no later than 30 days after receiving the proposed penalty assessment. If the operator fails to notify the Secretary, the proposed penalty assessment is deemed a final order of the Commission. 30 U.S.C. § 815(a).

On December 15, 2005 and January 19, 2006, the Department of Labor’s Mine Safety and Health Administration (“MSHA”) sent to Wabash the proposed penalty assessments at issue, which were received by the company on February 7 and 9, 2006. Motions at 1. Wabash states that although it intended to contest the assessments, it failed to do so in a timely fashion because of a misunderstanding as to who was to file the contest. *Id.* at 1-2. The Secretary states that she does not oppose Wabash’s requests for relief.

---

<sup>1</sup> Pursuant to Commission Procedural Rule 12, on our own motion, we hereby consolidate docket numbers LAKE 2006-118 and LAKE 2006-119, both captioned *Wabash Mine Holding Company* and both involving similar procedural issues. 29 C.F.R. § 2700.12.

We have held that in appropriate circumstances, we possess jurisdiction to reopen uncontested assessments that have become final Commission orders under section 105(a). *Jim Walter Res., Inc.*, 15 FMSHRC 782, 786-89 (May 1993) (“*JWR*”). In evaluating requests to reopen final section 105(a) orders, the Commission has found guidance in Rule 60(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure under which, for example, a party could be entitled to relief from a final order of the Commission on the basis of inadvertence or mistake. *See* 29 C.F.R. § 2700.1(b) (“the Commission and its Judges shall be guided so far as practicable by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure”); *JWR*, 15 FMSHRC at 787. We have also observed that default is a harsh remedy and that, if the defaulting party can make a showing of good cause for a failure to timely respond, the case may be reopened and appropriate proceedings on the merits permitted. *See Coal Prep. Servs., Inc.*, 17 FMSHRC 1529, 1530 (Sept. 1995).

Having reviewed Wabash’s motions, in the interests of justice, we remand these matters to the Chief Administrative Law Judge for a determination of whether good cause exists for Wabash’s failure to timely contest the penalty proposals and whether relief from the final orders should be granted. If it is determined that such relief is appropriate, these cases shall proceed pursuant to the Mine Act and the Commission’s Procedural Rules, 29 C.F.R. Part 2700.

---

Michael F. Duffy, Chairman

---

Mary Lu Jordan, Commissioner

---

Stanley C. Suboleski, Commissioner

---

Michael G. Young, Commissioner

## Distribution

R. Henry Moore, Esq.  
Jackson Kelly, PLLC  
Three Gateway Center, Suite 1340  
401 Liberty Avenue  
Pittsburgh, PA 15222

W. Christian Schumann, Esq.  
Office of the Solicitor  
U.S. Department of Labor  
1100 Wilson Blvd., 22<sup>nd</sup> Floor West  
Arlington, VA 22209-2247

Chief Administrative Law Judge Robert J. Lesnick  
Federal Mine Safety & Health Review Commission  
601 New Jersey Avenue, N.W., Suite 9500  
Washington, D.C. 20001-2021